



**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**Applicant(s):** Juho Jumppanen, et al.

**Examiner:** Krishnan S. Menon

**Serial No.:** 10/047,244

**Art Unit:** 1723

**Filed:** January 14, 2002

**Docket:** 15208Z

**For:** PROCESS FOR SEPARATING ESSENTIAL  
OILS FROM AN ESSENTIAL  
OIL-CONTAINING MATERIAL

**Dated:** February 9, 2004

Commissioner for Patents  
Mail Stop RCE  
Arlington, VA 22313

**SUPPLEMENTAL COMMENTS TO ADVISORY ACTION**

Sir:

In view of certain statements contained in the Advisory Action of January 15, 2004, the Applicants provide the following supplemental comments. It is the applicant's position that statements made in the Advisory Action concerning Perry and JP '994 are not accurate and ignore the substantial differences between the applicants' invention and teachings of the prior art references. Whether Perry uses the term "extractive distillation" is irrelevant since Perry is directed to a process which is quite different from the extraction step referred to in step (i) of the

---

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, M.S. AF, Arlington, VA 22313 on February 9, 2004.

Dated: February 9, 2004

Richard J. Danyko

present Claim 1. The applicant believes that the Examiner is reading the present claims broader than is reasonably permissible, which is at odds with the law, since there can be no question that the kind of distillation taught by Perry teaches away from the kind of distillation that is the subject of the present claims. Secondly, paragraph [0024] of JP '994 clearly does not describe recycling of steam or water. Paragraph [0024] refers to the transfer of the partially de-oiled water from the preliminary treatment stages ((2) and (5) in the Figure of D1) to the packed column (1).

In any event, the applicants are of the position that the claims now presented recite the invention in a manner that render the prior art combination deficient. See, e.g. claim 1 as presented in the Response after Final and the first full paragraph of the Remarks at page 6 of same.

Wherefore, based upon the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present case is in condition for allowance, and an early reply to this paper is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Richard J. Danyko', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Richard J. Danyko  
Registration No. 33,672

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, NY 11530  
(516) 742-4343  
RJD:ej